

Eagleview Recreation Site

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, has analyzed a proposal called the **Eagleview Recreation Site**. In the proposed action, the development of a recreation facility would occur in the Middle Umpqua Frontal Analytical Watershed, located in Sections 11; T24S R7W.

The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-106-94-17, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

1. Approximately eight acres were analyzed for development, which represents less than 0.1% of the watershed landbase.
2. The Interdisciplinary Team identified two key issues to be analyzed; 1) Hydrologic Flow, and 2) Impacts of Vegetation Conversion (EA, pg. 6).
3. The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, pg. 4) or cultural resources (EA, pg. 14).
4. Formal consultation with the US Fish & Wildlife Service has been completed. The Biological Opinion determined that the proposed action is " . . . not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat."
5. Informal consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service has been completed. The Letter of Concurrence concluded that this project was " . . . not likely to adversely affect Oregon coast coho salmon or its critical habitat."

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP) dated June 2, 1995*. This proposal is located on lands within Late-successional Reserve and Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations. The RMP permits the design of "new recreational facilities within Riparian Reserves, including trails and dispersed sites, so as to not prevent meeting Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives . . ." (RMP, pg. 26)

Finding of No Significant Impacts: I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines (S&Gs, pg. B-10) I find that the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and meets or does not prevent attainment of these objectives.

Jay K. Carlson
Swiftwater Field Manager

Date

Test for Significant Impacts. (40 CFR 1508.27)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The project would generally be beneficial due to the introduction of control to the dispersed recreation currently evidenced on the site.

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: Considering the current state of public health and safety issues at the proposed recreation site (EA, pgs. 11-12), the project would improve public health and safety at this location because of the presence of the campground host, maintenance personnel, and law enforcement.

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) does not show that the proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics (EA, pg. 14).

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: No controversial effects were noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.

5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.

6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The advertisement and employment of a service contract allowing development of a recreation site is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.

8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The EA (pg. 14) does not indicate that this action would adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?

Aquatic Species	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Botanical Species	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Terrestrial Species	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Remarks: Consultation with NMFS (March 2, 1999) resulted in a "not likely to adversely affect" determination for listed fish. Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants therefore consultation was not required. Formal consultation with the FWS (January 10, 2001) for the Eagleview Campground Reconstruction action which concluded that the activity is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat.

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.